

DRAFT RESULTS – WORKING DOCUMENT

(Discussion still in progress)

Context: This discussion was intended to either confirm the relevancy and appropriateness of the state's current goals related to alcohol control, or to identify suggested changes. The participants were directed to consider the goal only ("what") and not "how" the goals are or should be achieved (supporting statutes, rules and interpretations). The "state's working interpretation" is not an official definition, but was crafted for the purpose of the discussion.

State Policy Goal #1 – Adopted:

- ***To prevent the misuse of alcohol.***
 - ***"Misuse of alcohol" includes underage sales/drinking, driving while under the influence, serving to inebriated consumers, public inebriation, sales outside of the regulated system, or any other use that could promote public harm or create safety or nuisance issues.***
- ***In an attempt to prevent misuse the state should not affect responsible moderate consumption.***
 - ***"Responsible moderate consumption" is the public sale/consumption of alcohol by legal adults, without misuse.***

Discussion Result:

A majority of the Task Force agreed that this policy goal is relevant and valid for the state to pursue. An amendment to move the word "public" to follow "...that could promote" was adopted.

Discussion Items (summary, not necessarily individual comments):

- The term "public use" is inaccurate since private use can result in public harm.
- The state should not promote alcoholism, and should take an active role in reducing alcoholism.
 - The state's policy goals should not reach into people's homes to affect private activity that results in no public harm.
 - The state's policy goals should not place a burden on retailers to make determinations about whether an individual is an alcoholic.
 - Since alcoholism is an illness, the state should not make being an alcoholic illegal.

DRAFT RESULTS – WORKING DOCUMENT
(Discussion still in progress)

State Policy Goal #2 – Adopted:

To promote the efficient collection of taxes.

- State's Working Interpretation: readily available and reliable information about all sales in order to effectively collect accurate state taxes.

Discussion Results:

General consensus that it is appropriate for the state to pursue this goal.

State Policy Goal #3 – Adopted:

To promote the public interest in fostering the orderly and responsible distribution of malt beverages and wine towards effective control of consumption.

- State's Working Interpretation: avoidance of pressure on any one industry (producers, distributors, or retailers) from another that would cause collusion or result in unfair advantages or disadvantages that may result in over-consumption or increased access by minors.

Discussion Result:

A majority of the Task Force agreed it is appropriate for the state to pursue this policy goal, with the state's current working interpretation of the goal incorporated into the statement of the policy goal.

Discussion Items (summary, not necessarily individual comments):

- The state's working definition is more meaningful than the simple goal statement by itself.
- Some task force members believe this concept is better stated as be a strategy that supports the other two goals. The LCB is not wedded to this being considered a goal or a strategy.
- Economic development is possibly a separate policy goal, not encompassed by the goal of "orderly and responsible distribution."
- A proposed definition of "orderly" was rejected – "conduct that is in compliance with federal and state competition laws and federal and state alcohol beverage laws."

DRAFT RESULTS – WORKING DOCUMENT
(Discussion still in progress)

NOTE: The discussion will continue at the Task Force meeting on June 15 with potential consideration of a fourth goal related to the state's role in promoting business and employment, and a discussion of the state's current three high-level *strategies* to accomplish the goals.

These current state strategies will be discussed at the June 15 meeting:

- Is the state's policy strategy to **separate the three tiers** still appropriate/relevant?

State's working definition/interpretation: *Each tier serves different functions in the supply chain from production to consumer consumption. Restrictions in the business relationship between the tiers are important to support policy goals.*

- Is the state's policy strategy to **ensure a “level playing field”** still appropriate/relevant?

State's working definition/interpretation: *To enable equitable competition among large, medium and small industries within and among the tiers, in order to avoid collusion and domination by a few (and undue influence) and to mitigate illegal sales.*

- Is the state's policy strategy to **control flow through licensing** still appropriate/relevant?

State's working definition/interpretation: *To monitor and control the availability of alcohol, to enable effective tax collection and to enforce statutes and rules.*